REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated August 18, 2011, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 18-23 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 18, 20, 22 and 23 have been amended; and claim 19 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I.   Interview Summary

The Applicants thank Examiner Phantana-Angkool for granting the telephone interview (hereafter "interview") with the Applicants' representative, which was conducted on November 3, 2011. During the interview, the distinguishable features between the present invention (as recited in new independent claim 18) and the cited prior art were discussed in detail. An Appendix of Proposed Claim Changes (hereafter "Appendix") was also provided to the Examiner for his consideration.

During the interview, it was noted that independent claim 18 has been amended (i.e., in the Appendix) to include the features of claim 19 and clarify what is meant by a GUI player, as suggested in item 11, page 5 of the Office Action. Additionally, it was noted that, with the present invention (as recited in independent claim 18), the conversion rule associates the screen event (i.e., the event related to the GUI content) with the device event (i.e., the event interpretable for the application). The use of the conversion rule allows the GUI player to indirectly access the device resource which the GUI player cannot directly access. Additionally, a change of the conversion rule allows various GUI contents and GUI players, which are created for other systems, to be used without changing the device resource.

On the other hand, it was noted that Jouet in col. 7, lines 55-65 merely discloses that since different types of GUIs have features in common, graphic objects may be created by using the common features. Jouet fails to disclose the change of a conversion rule in accordance with a GUI player to allow various GUI players to access device resources, as recited in independent claim 18.

At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner acknowledged the differences between the present invention and the cited prior art. However, the Examiner also suggested additional amendments to the claims to clarify what is meant by screen event and device event. The

Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments in the Appendix and the amendments suggested by him would help to distinguish the claims from the cited prior art. However, the Examiner also indicated that an updated search of the prior art would be necessary before making a final determination regarding the allowability of the claims.

II. Claim Objection

In the Office Action, claim 18 is objected because the phrase "said conversation section" should be "said conversion section." The Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to correct the above phrase, as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 18 is respectfully requested.

III. Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 18-20, 22 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jouet et al. (U.S. 7,030,890, hereafter "Jouet") in view of Conley et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0011633, hereafter "Conley").

Claim 19 has been cancelled thereby rendering the rejection to that claim moot. Additionally, the Applicants have amended independent claims 18, 22 and 23 to more clearly distinguish the independent claims from the cited prior art. The amendments to independent claims 18, 22 and 23 are consistent with the Appendix of claim changes and the amendments suggested by the Examiner, which were discussed during the interview conducted on November 3, 2011. For example, independent 18 (as amended) now recites the following features:

"[a] display process apparatus comprising:

an application;

a device resource which is another application;

a display screen;

a GUI player configured to reproduce and display, on said display screen, a GUI content used by said application; and

a conversion section configured to, by using a conversion rule, convert from screen event information for the display of the GUI content displayed on said display screen by said GUI player into device event information that is interpretable for said device resource, the conversion rule associating the screen event information related to the GUI content with the device event information interpretable for said device resource,

6

wherein the device resource reports, to said application, a result of an interpretation executed based on the device event information converted by said conversion section,

the application processes the screen event information related to said GUI player in accordance with the result of interpretation reported from said device resource, and

the conversion section changes the conversion rule in accordance with said GUI player used by the display process apparatus, to allow various GUI players to access said device resource." (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in independent claim 18 are similarly recited in independent claims 22 and 23. That is, independent claims 22 and 23 are corresponding method and program claims (respectively); and both claims recites steps directed to the features of the apparatus of claim 18. Additionally, the features emphasized above in independent claim 18 (and similarly recited in independent claims 22 and 23) are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure.

Independent claims 18, 22 and 23 have been amended to include the features of claim 19 and to clarify what is meant by a GUI player, as suggested in item 11, page 5 of Office Action. Additionally, independent claims 18, 22 and 23 have been amended to clarify what is meant by screen event and device event, as suggested by the Examiner during the interview conducted on November 3, 2011.

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23) is believed to be distinguished from the cited prior art in that by using a conversion rule, screen event information for the display of the GUI content displayed on a display screen by a GUI player is converted into device event information that is interpretable for a device resource. The conversion rule associates the screen event information related to the GUI content with the device event information interpretable for the device resource. Additionally, a conversion rule can be changed in accordance with the GUI player to allow various GUI players to access the device resource.

With the present invention (as recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23), the use of the conversion rule allows the GUI player to indirectly access the device resource which the GUI player cannot directly access. And, a change of the conversion rule allows various GUI contents and GUI players, which are created for other systems, to be used without changing the device resource.

In the Office Action, although the Examiner relies on the combination of Jouet and Conley for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23, the Examiner relies specifically on col. 6, lines 47-65; and col. 65, lines 54-67 of Jouet for disclosing the features of the conversion section and conversion step, recited respectively in independent claims 18, 22 and 23. The Applicants assert that Jouet in col. 6, lines 47-65; and col. 65, lines 54-67 fails to disclose or suggest the features of the conversion section and conversion step now recited respectively in independent claims 18, 22 and 23, as amended.

As noted above, independent claim 18 (as amended) recites:

"a conversion section configured to, by using a conversion rule, convert from screen event information for the display of the GUI content displayed on said display screen by said GUI player into device event information that is interpretable for said device resource, the conversion rule associating the screen event information related to the GUI content with the device event information interpretable for said device resource...

the conversion section changes the conversion rule in accordance with said GUI player used by the display process apparatus, to allow various GUI players to access said device resource. " These features noted with reference to independent claim 18 are similarly recited in independent claims 22 and 23.

As noted above, independent claims 18, 22 and 23 have been amended to include the features of claim 19 and clarify what is meant by a GUI player, as suggested in item 11, page 5 of the Office Action. Additionally, independent claims 18, 22 and 23 have been amended to clarify what is meant by screen event and device event, as suggested by the Examiner during the interview conducted on November 3, 2011.

Jouet in col. 6, lines 47-65 discloses a method for controlling the appearance of graphical objects in a graphical user interface by associating a look object with graphical objects. The graphical objects include a linked chain, and a particular look or design can be applied to the chain or linked list as a whole. Additionally, the method of displaying the group of graphical objects includes defining different displayable groups of graphical objects and selecting a group of graphical objects from the displayable groups.

Additionally, Jouet in col. 65, lines 54-67 discloses different techniques for controlling the look of an object that includes the use of a bit map and vectorial. Using the bitmap technique, the object is drawn by combining a number of predefined bitmap elements to create a

single bitmap; and using the vectorial technique, the object is drawn using a series of basic drawing operations.

As noted above, Jouet (i.e., col. 6, lines 47-65; and col. 65, lines 54-67) discloses generally the control and display of objects using bit map and vectorial techniques. Additionally, Jouet (e.g., col. 7, lines 55-65) also discloses that since different types of GUIs have features in common, graphic objects may be created by using the common features.

However, Jouet (i.e., col. 6, lines 47-65; col. 65, lines 54-67; and col. 7, lines 55-65) fails to disclose that by using a conversion rule, screen event information for the display of the GUI content displayed on a display screen by a GUI player is converted into device event information that is interpretable for a device resource, wherein the conversion rule associates the screen event information related to the GUI content with the device event information interpretable for the device resource. Additionally, Jouet (i.e., col. 6, lines 47-65; col. 65, lines 54-67; and col. 7, lines 55-65) fails to disclose the change of a conversion rule in accordance with a GUI player to allow various GUI players to access device resources, as recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23.

As noted above, independent claims 18, 22 and 23 have been amended to include the features of claim 19 and clarify what is meant by a GUI player, as suggested in item 11, page 5 of the Office Action. Additionally, independent claims 18, 22 and 23 have been amended to clarify what is meant by screen event and device event, as suggested by the Examiner during the interview conducted on November 3, 2011. Moreover, at the conclusion of that interview, the Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments in the Appendix and the amendments suggested by him would help to distinguish the claims from the cited prior art.

Based on the above discussion, no combination of Jouet and Conley would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the features now recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23 (as amended). Likewise, no combination of Jouet and Conley would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the features of claim 20 at least by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 18.

In the Office Action, claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jouet in view of Conley, and further in view of Najmi (U.S. 6,959,340, hereafter "Najmi")

9

Claim 21 depends (indirectly) from independent claim 18. As noted above, Jouet and Conley fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claim 18. Moreover, Najmi fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Jouet and Conley. Accordingly, no combination of Jouet and Conley with Najmi would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the features of claim 21 at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 18.

IV.   **Conclusion**

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any issues remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Hidehiko SHIN et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

Digitally signed by /Mark D. Pratt/
DN: cn=/Mark D. Pratt/, o, ou,
email=wlp@wenderoth.com, c=US
Date: 2011.11.17 12:20:42 -05'00'

By _____
Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/lkd
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 17, 2011

10